Applicant: Samir Raiyani, et al.

Serial No.: 10/743,348

Filed: December 23, 2003

Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 13909-138001 / 2003P00442

US01

REMARKS

Initially, in response to the requirement to restrict indicated in the Office Action dated June 8, 2007, the Applicants hereby elect to prosecute the Group II claims, namely claims 14 to 21, without traverse. Examination of these claims is therefore respectfully requested.

The Applicants note that non-elected claims 1 to 13 and 22 to 31 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and that new claims 32 to 47 have been added. Notably, new computer program product claims 32 to 39 recite features that are similar to the features recited by elected method claims 14 to 21, respectively, and new device claims 40 to 47 also recite features (in means-plus-function form) that are similar to the features recited by the elected method claims 14 to 21, respectively.

In accordance with MPEP § 808, it is clear that, in order to require a restriction between independent of distinct "inventions," reasons for insisting upon a restriction requirement, such as undue burden, must be shown. With regard to the new claims, which include similar features recited using different statutory classes, it is not believed that there would be undue burden in examining these different groups of claims in a single application. Specifically, these newly added claims are not so different as would require a burden on the Examiner that is significantly beyond that of the normal burdens of examination.

No fees are believed to be due at this time. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:	June 14, 2007	/David E. A. Jordan
		David F A Jordan

David E. A. Jordan Reg. No. 50325

Fish & Richardson P.C. 1425 K Street, N.W. 11th Floor Washington, DC 20005-3500 Telephone: (202) 783-5070 Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40425276.doc